

---

---

# 4D

## Information

### *Professional Services Committee*

#### **Update on the Review of the Accreditation Framework**

---

**Executive Summary:** In May 2004, the Commission approved the formation of an Accreditation Study Work Group comprised of members of the Committee on Accreditation and representatives of stakeholders to review and recommend any changes, if needed, to the Commission's accreditation system for educator preparation in California. This report presents an update on the activities undertaken thus far related to this review.

**Recommended Action:** This is an information item that requires no action.

**Presenters:** Teri Clark, Consultant and Cheryl Hickey, Consultant, Professional Services Division.



---

# Update on the Review of the Accreditation Framework

---

## Introduction

In January 2004, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) directed the Committee on Accreditation (COA) to meet with stakeholders to identify options for establishing a process for the review of the Commission's *Accreditation Framework* that would be open, inclusive of key stakeholders, and consultative. After several meetings with stakeholders to discuss various options for conducting the review, the COA provided the Commission with three options for its consideration, with a preferred option identified. At its meeting in May 2004, the Commission approved the recommended option and, as a result, authorized the formation of an Accreditation Study Work Group. This study group, comprised of four members of the Committee on Accreditation and various representatives from the education stakeholder community, is charged with reviewing the Commission's current accreditation system and recommending any changes, if needed, to the Committee on Accreditation for its consideration. In turn, the Committee on Accreditation will submit its recommendations for changes to the system to the Commission for its consideration. This report provides an update of activities that have taken place in recent weeks related to this review.

## Background

The Commission is responsible for ensuring that all programs that prepare educators to teach in California's K-12 public schools are of sufficient quality. One critical way that the Commission performs this function is through its system of accreditation that attempts to determine whether, in fact, approved programs are implementing programs that meet the Commission's adopted standards of quality and effectiveness.

The current *Accreditation Framework*, which contains the Commission's accreditation policies for educator preparation, was adopted in 1995 following enactment of SB 148 by Senator Marian Bergeson (Chapter 1455, Statutes of 1988) and SB 655 (Bergeson, Chapter 426, Statutes of 1993). Over the past decade, several major developments have taken place that suggest that a review and possible redesign of the existing system is both timely and appropriate. Further, last spring, the Commission satisfied the California Education Code requirement that the Commission ensure completion of an independent evaluation of the *Framework*. In March 2003, the American Institutes for Research (AIR) submitted a final report on its three-year evaluation of the *Framework*. The report contains numerous findings and recommendations.

At its January 2004 meeting, the Commission directed the COA to meet with stakeholders to identify options for establishing a process for the review of the Commission's *Accreditation Framework* that would be open, inclusive of key stakeholders, and consultative. From January 2004 through March 2004, the COA met with stakeholders from California's education community to discuss possible ways in which to conduct the review that would be consistent with the Commission directive. At its March meeting, COA voted to submit to the Commission three options for moving forward with the review, and identified one preferred option. This preferred option had been jointly developed by members of the COA and representatives from California's education community.

In May 2004, the Commission voted to approve the COA recommended course of action for the review which included the formation of an Accreditation Study Work Group comprised of four members of the COA and representatives of various stakeholders. Specifically, the study group includes the following representation:

- (a) two representatives from each of the three segments of higher education chosen by the segments;
- (b) two representatives from K-12 school districts or County Office of Education with a Commission-approved teacher education program;
- (c) two representatives from the teaching profession – one representative of the California Teachers Association and one from the California Federation of Teachers;
- (d) one representative from the Association of California School Administrators;
- (e) one representative from the California School Boards Association;
- (f) one representative from a Commission-approved subject matter programs;
- (g) one representative from a Commission-approved induction program; and
- (h) four members of the COA – two representing higher education and two representing K-12.

Under the course of action approved by the Commission, this single work group is responsible for much of the research, issue exploration, and identification of options for redesign. The recommendations and options from the work group will then be brought forth to the COA for its consideration. In turn, the COA will then bring its recommendations and options for any potential changes to the accreditation system to the Commission for its consideration. In order to ensure that all perspectives are addressed, the work group is co-facilitated by one representative of COA and one individual chosen by the stakeholders. Work group members are required to be vested with the authority to represent and speak on behalf of their institution, organization, or constituency group. They commit to communicating regularly with their respective constituency groups and reporting feedback from those groups. To the extent possible, the work group operates on a consensus model, although it was agreed that, where significant differences in perspectives exist, these differences will be reflected in documentation. Each representative, with the exception of the COA members serving on the work group, commits to supporting the costs of their segmental participation in the review process.

### **Initiating the Review Process – Forming the Accreditation Study Work Group**

Within days of the Commission's action, the Executive Director, on behalf of the Commission, sent a letter to the relevant stakeholder groups to advise them of the formation of the Accreditation Study Work Group, to inform them of the general purpose for the group, and to request that they appoint an individual to represent their perspective during this process.

Further, after considerable discussion at its regularly scheduled meeting on May 20, the COA selected four individuals from its membership to serve on the Accreditation Study Work Group. As a result of this action as well as successful response from the stakeholder community for appointments, the Commission's Accreditation Study Work Group currently has 18 members. Appendix A contains the names of the individuals serving on the work group.

In addition to selecting those members of the COA that would serve on the Accreditation Study Work Group, the COA was successful in accomplishing several tasks related to initiating the accreditation review at its meeting on May 20. In particular, the COA selected Ed Kujawa, current Co-Chair of the COA, to serve as one of the two Co-Facilitators of the work group, with the second Co-Facilitator to be chosen by the stakeholders at the first meeting of the work group.

Further, in order to facilitate a common understanding of the role of the work group as well as its relationship to the COA and the Commission, the COA adopted a charge for the workgroup. This charge was provided to the work group at its first meeting on June 16-17 and was among the first agenda items discussed by the work group during that meeting. A copy of the charge is included as Appendix B to this agenda item.

The COA also discussed and developed a general timeline for the review process as well as a concise list of deliverables and expectations for the work group. The general timeline proposed by COA took into consideration the Commission's schedule for 2004-2005 as well as a recognition that a key component of the review is to ensure frequent communication and interaction between the work group, the COA, and the Commission. A copy of the general timeline, deliverables and expectations was provided to the work group at its first meeting on June 16-17 and was also among the first agenda items discussed by the group during that meeting. A copy is included as Appendix C to this agenda item.

And finally, the COA acted to adopt a 2004-2005 schedule of meetings that took into consideration the projected needs to support and accomplish the review of the *Framework*. The COA adopted a schedule of meetings for both the COA and for the work group. The schedule of meetings adopted by the COA, and adjusted by the work group, is included as Appendix D to this agenda item.

### **First Meeting of Accreditation Study Work Group**

The first meeting of the Accreditation Study Work Group was held on June 16-17, 2004, at the Commission offices in Sacramento. To ensure that the first meeting was a productive and successful one, the Commission staff, with COA leadership, drafted an agenda and invited suggestions from those newly appointed to the work group. A conference call was held and an agenda was finalized after incorporating suggestions from the stakeholder representatives.

The primary goals for this first meeting included: (1) to understand the charge to the Accreditation Study Work Group and to establish group norms and procedures under which the group will conduct its work; (2) to agree to a set of meeting dates; (3) to ensure that all work group members have an understanding of accreditation of educator preparation in California and the context in which accreditation currently operates in California; (4) to identify issues that need to be addressed in the review; and (5) to begin to establish a workplan that will ensure that the work group addresses each of the identified issues.

Although several of the goals for the first meeting require on-going discussion, most were largely accomplished. In addition to reviewing the charge provided to them by COA, agreeing to future meeting dates, and agreeing to a set of group norms, those members of the work group representing stakeholders selected Beverly Young, from the California State University Office of the Chancellor to serve as Co-Facilitator.

The group focused much of its first meeting on identifying the numerous issues that would need to be addressed throughout the review process and attempting to determine a plan for addressing these issues. Using the information gathered from stakeholders at the January 2004 COA meeting as a starting point, the work group generated an extensive, yet not exhaustive list of issues requiring attention during the review. From group discussion, it was determined that some issues needed to be addressed at the outset of the review.

As such, the group identified several topics to be studied and discussed at the August and September meetings of the study group. The August meeting will focus on (1) the purpose of

accreditation and whether the Commission's current accreditation system is consistent with the recent literature on the topic and general trends in accreditation; (2) the role of the Commission; (3) the role of the COA; and (4) issues related to national accreditation.

In keeping with the intent of an open line of communication between the work group, the COA, and the Commission, the work group will provide an update of its activities and discussions to the COA at its meeting on August 19<sup>th</sup>.

In September, the work group will discuss issues related to: (1) induction, subject matter, and fifth year; (2) federal and state accountability issues; (3) the nature of data used by others for accreditation purposes; (4) accreditation in other professions; and (5) interim reporting mechanisms used by other accrediting bodies.

Among the other topics to be discussed in the first few meetings is the manner in which accreditation can more effectively contribute to the on-going cycle of program improvement and the impact of the changes resulting from SB 2042, such as the move away from "factors to consider" for accreditation purposes to required elements within standards.

Consistent with the Commission's directive that the review process be open, inclusive, and transparent, informal meeting notes and all meeting materials will be available for review on the Commission's website.

The next meeting for the accreditation study work group is scheduled for August 17-18, 2004 at the Commission office. An update of the work group and COA activities related to this review will be provided to the Commission at the September 30-October 1, 2004 meeting.

## Appendix A

### Accreditation Study Work Group Roster

<b><i>Representing the Independent California Colleges and Universities</i></b>	
Ellen Curtis-Pierce Assistant Provost for Teacher Education Office of the Provost, Chapman University	Terrance Cannings, Dean School of Education and Behavioral Studies, Azusa Pacific University
<b><i>Representing the California State University</i></b>	
Beverly Young (Work Group Co-Facilitator) Assistant Vice Chancellor, Teacher Education and Public School Programs Office of the Chancellor, California State University	Iris Riggs Associate Dean, Division of Teacher Education College of Education CSU San Bernardino
<b><i>Representing the University of California</i></b>	
Diane Mayer Associate Dean for Professional Programs UC Berkeley, Graduate School of Education	Barbara Merino Director of Teacher Education UC Davis, School of Education
<b><i>Representing the Association of California School Administrators</i></b> Sonny DaMarto, Superintendent Burlingame Elementary School District	<b><i>Representing the California School Boards Association</i></b> Luan Rivera, Vice President, CSBA Ramona Unified School District
<b><i>Representing the California Teachers Association</i></b> Joyce Abrams Chula Vista Elementary School District	<b><i>Representing the California Federation of Teachers</i></b> Sue Westbrook Senior Vice President, ECK-12 Council
<b><i>Representing Commission-approved Subject Matter Preparation Programs</i></b> Claire Palmerino Director, Academic Advising Services Center for Careers in Teaching CSU Fullerton	<b><i>Representing Commission-approved Induction Programs</i></b> Linda Childress BTSA Director RIMS (Riverside, Inyo, Mono, San Bernardino Counties) BTSA
<b><i>Representing Commission-approved Internship Program</i></b>	
Mary Lewis, Administrator Alternative Certification and Teacher Support Los Angeles Unified School District	Margaret S. Fortune Executive Director Project Pipeline
<b><i>Representing the Committee on Accreditation</i></b>	
Ed Kujawa (Work Group Co-Facilitator) Dean Dominican University of California	Lynne Cook Professor California State University, Northridge
Dana Griggs, Assistant Superintendent Ontario-Montclair School District	Karen O'Connor, Teacher Poway Unified School District, Adobe Bluff

# Appendix B

## Committee on Accreditation

### Charge to the Accreditation Study Work Group Approved as Amended, 05/20/04

Under the direction and leadership of the Committee on Accreditation (COA), the Accreditation Study Work Group (study group) will review and propose changes, if needed, to the Commission's accreditation policies, as currently contained in the *Accreditation Framework*, and to the accreditation procedures for COA consideration and action. In turn, the COA will then present COA's recommendations to the Commission for its consideration and action.

Constituency group representatives should draw upon their knowledge, expertise, and experience and share their unique perspectives and that of their constituency group on the accreditation matters to be considered. COA members on the study group will serve in a manner that is consistent with their role as described in the current *Framework*. That is, they are leading educators chosen to bring their extensive experience and professional expertise to bear, and are not representatives of specific organizations, institutions or constituencies. As a whole, the study group will propose changes to the policies and procedures that it believes are in the best interest of the state of California, its new teachers and the students they educate; that facilitate an understanding by all of the quality and effectiveness of educator preparation programs; and that contribute to program improvement.

In addressing specific accreditation issues, the study group will consider the following:

- Issues raised by members of the Commission, members of the COA, and stakeholders; issues raised by and contained in the evaluation of the existing system conducted by the American Institutes for Research; and adherence to the Preliminary Guiding Principles for the Accreditation Review Process agreed to by the Commission, the COA, and representative stakeholders;
- The current educational policy environment characterized by a demand for greater accountability, which includes, among other things, quantifiable indicators of program quality and effectiveness.
- Current research and best practices in accreditation, which includes, among other things, a greater emphasis on effectiveness and performance; and historical knowledge of the evolution of accreditation of educator preparation in California;
- The current standards-based approach to educator preparation and the learning to teach continuum as envisioned and implemented by the enactment of SB 2042; and
- A design concept that recognizes the fiscal environment in which the Commission and educational institutions must operate is one characterized by year to year fluctuations in state resources. Any proposed redesign of accreditation should recognize this reality and should ensure cost efficiencies, while at the same time maintain the integrity of the accreditation process.



# Appendix C

## Accreditation Study Work Group Timeline, Deliverables and Expectations

### Timeline

Although there is no specific time requirement for completion of the accreditation review and possible redesign, the option adopted by the Commission cited a six to 12 month timeframe. As such, the work of the work group and the Committee on Accreditation would be focused on providing the Commission with recommendations for consideration at its June 2005 Commission meeting, with action to be taken at its August 2005 meeting. (However, Commission feedback will have been sought throughout the entire process.)

The Commission set its schedule of meetings for 2004-05 at its May meeting. The Committee on Accreditation also established its schedule of meetings at its meeting on May 20. In order to meet the June 2005 target for the Commission, the Committee on Accreditation would need to act upon the recommendations at its March 17, 2004 meeting, ensuring there is still sufficient time to meet the Commission agenda deadlines.

The proposed timeframe of meetings (see attached) from June 2004 to June 2005 takes into consideration the relationship between and interconnectedness of the work group, the Committee on Accreditation, and the Commission. The work group will need to discuss the feasibility of the dates proposed and make any necessary revisions at its first meeting on June 16-17.

### Deliverables and Expectations

The Study group will have broad discretion to establish a workplan to accomplish the objectives. However, the COA and the work group will agree to a set of deliverables that includes, at a minimum:

- 1) A list accreditation study work group meeting dates to be presented for information at the August COA meeting;
- 2) A general outline of a workplan to be presented at the August COA meeting.
- 3) An update of activities at each COA meeting. This will include presentation to the COA of various aspects of an eventual preliminary proposal, as appropriate, throughout the process. Beyond an update, significant time at three to four COA meeting will be devoted to substantive dialogue with representatives of the working group.
- 4) Completion of the review and proposed changes to the Commission's accreditation policies and procedures to be presented to COA for consideration and action at its spring 2005 meeting (March 17th). In turn, the COA will then present recommendations to the Commission for information at the June 2005 meeting, with action anticipated at the Commission August 2005 meeting. Once the Commission has an opportunity to discuss as an information item, the COA would meet on June 15<sup>th</sup> to discuss any outstanding issues that arise at that time, in preparation for August action of the Commission.

# Appendix D

## Accreditation Review Work Plan

### Schedule of Meetings

	Accreditation Study Work Group (Work Group)	Committee on Accreditation (COA)	Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission)
Mar 2004		25 <sup>th</sup> - Finalize options for Review of Accreditation Framework- forward to Commission for action	
Apr 2004			
May 2004		20 <sup>th</sup> - Based on action taken by the Commission on May 6, finalize charge to the work group	6 <sup>th</sup> -Options for the Review of the Accreditation Framework (action item)
Jun 2004	16 <sup>th</sup> & 17 <sup>th</sup> - First meeting of the work group —see tentative dates below:		
Jul 2004	No meeting		
Aug 2004	17 <sup>th</sup> -18 <sup>th</sup> -Meeting (begin in the afternoon 17 <sup>th</sup> )	19 <sup>th</sup> -Report from Work Group To include workplan.	12 <sup>th</sup> - Report from COA
Sept 2004	22 <sup>nd</sup> - 23 <sup>rd</sup> Meeting		
Oct 2004	20 <sup>th</sup> - Meeting	21 <sup>st</sup> - Report from Work Group	1 <sup>st</sup> -Report from COA
Nov 2004	16-17 <sup>th</sup> - Meeting		
Dec 2004	No meeting		1 <sup>st</sup> -Report from COA
Jan 2005	26 <sup>th</sup> - Meeting	27 <sup>th</sup> -28 <sup>th</sup> - Report from Work Group	
Feb 2005	16 <sup>th</sup> - 17 <sup>th</sup> Meeting		1 <sup>st</sup> - Report from COA
Mar 2005	16 <sup>th</sup> -Draft proposal prepared for COA	17 <sup>th</sup> Review proposal, forward to Commission for information	11 <sup>th</sup> - Report from COA
Apr 2005			14 <sup>th</sup> - Report from COA
May 2005			
Jun 2005		9 <sup>th</sup> - Action to forward recommendation(s) to the Commission for action	1 <sup>st</sup> - Recommendation(s) from COA (information)
Jul 2005			
Aug 2005			11 <sup>th</sup> - Recommendation(s) from COA (action)